UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/528,363	03/17/2000	Mason Ng	40827.00039	4258

36614 7590 06/09/2006

MANATT PHELPS AND PHILLIPS
ROBERT D. BECKER
1001 PAGE MILL ROAD, BUILDING 2
PALO ALTO, CA 94304

EXAMINER	
LIN, KENNY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/528,363	NG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenny Lin	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 April 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Narasimhan et al (hereinafter Narasimhan), US Patent 6,073,165.

5. Narasimhan was cited in the previous office action.

6. As per claims 1-2, Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method, comprising:

a. examining start criteria (col.1, lines 46-49, col.2, lines 3-6, col.5, lines 3-35; e.g. filter and forwarding parameters);

b. determining whether the start criteria have been met (col.5, lines 18-40); and

c. obtaining new email events from an email database after the start criteria have been met (col.4, lines 6-11, col.5, lines 37-40, 50-60, col.6, lines 3-6, 11-21, 40-56).

d. forward information corresponding to the new email events via a computer network to a database (col.4, lines 6-11, col.5, lines 3-17, col.6, lines 11-21, 40-56).

7. As per claims 3-4, Narasimhan taught the claimed invention including a method, comprising:

a. Establishing a communication channel with a client computer system (col.1, lines 40-43, col.2, lines 50-65, col.3, lines 39-44);

b. Obtaining new email events from an email database (col.6, lines 3-6);

c. Receiving information corresponding to the new email events from the client computer system (col.4, lines 6-11, col.6, lines 11-21, 40-56); and

d. Storing the information corresponding to the new email events in a database (col.4, lines 6-11, col.6, lines 11-21, 40-56).

8. As per claims 5-6, Narasimhan taught the claimed invention including a method, comprising:

a. Obtaining filter control data (col.1, lines 46-49, col.2, lines 3-6);

b. Examining email data against the filter control data (col.5, lines 3-17);

c. Determine the email data that will be forwarded based on the examination (col.5, lines 3-40);

d. Selecting at least one transfer protocol for the email data based on the examination (col.5, lines 18-26, 37-49, col.6, lines 40-56, col.7, lines 39-45); and

e. Forwarding the email data according to the at least one transfer protocol via a computer network to a database (col.6, lines 19-21, 40-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-2 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al (hereinafter Chen), US Patent 6,510,455, in view of Paarsmarkt et al (hereinafter Paarsmarkt), US Patent 6,118,856, Narasimhan et al (hereinafter Narasimhan), US Patent 6,073,165.

11. Chen and Paarsmarkt were cited in the previous office action.

12. As per claims 1-2, Chen taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method, comprising:

a. examining start criteria (col.6, lines 12-22);

b. determining whether the start criteria have been met (col.6, lines 12-22, 25-31); and

c. obtaining new email events from an email database after the start criteria have been met (col.6, lines 25-52).

13. Chen did not specifically teach the method to forward information corresponding to the new email events via a computer network to a database using an HTTP port. However, Paarsmarkt taught an email system to forward information or portion of information corresponding to the new email events via a computer network (col.2, lines 1-4, 15-17, 25-29, 48-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and Paarsmarkt because Paarsmarkt's teaching of forwarding information or portion of information enables users to specify condition for forwarding received email to a remote device in Chen's email system and provide Chen's email system selective forwarding benefits (see Paarsmarkt, col.2, lines 1-4, 48-52). Chen and Paarsmarkt did not specifically teach to forward information to a database using an HTTP port. Narasimhan taught to store the information into database (col.4, lines 6-11, col.6, lines 11-21, 40-56) and HTTP protocol communication (col.3, lines 39-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of

Chen, Paarsmarkt and Narasimhan because Narasimhan's teaching of storing the forwarded information in a database enables subsequent recall of information from the database (see Narasimhan, col.6, lines 11-21).

14. Claims 7-8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan et al (hereinafter Narasimhan), US Patent 6,073,165, in view of Moon et al (hereinafter Moon), US Patent 6,138,146.

15. Moon was cited in the previous office action.

16. As per claims 7-8, Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method, comprising:

a. Obtaining filter control data (col.1, lines 46-49, col.2, lines 3-6);
b. Examining email data against the filter control data (col.5, lines 3-17); and
c. Determining based on the examination the email data that should not be forwarded (col.2, lines 3-6, col.5, lines 3-23);
d. Generating receipt data identifying the email data that should be forwarded (col.1, lines 46-51, col.4, lines 6-11, col.6, lines 11-18); and
e. Forwarding the receipt data via a computer network to a database (col.4, lines 6-11, col.6, lines 11-21, 40-56).

17. Narasimhan did not specifically teach the step of generating receipt data identifying the email data that should not be forwarded. Instead, Narasimhan taught to generate receipt data identifying the email data that should be forwarded (col.1, lines 46-51, col.4, lines 6-11, col.6, lines 11-18) and forward the receipt data via a computer network to a database (col.6, lines 19-21, 40-56). However, it would have been obvious that by identifying the email data that should be forwarded is equivalent to identify the email data that should not be forwarded. Moon taught to identify the email data that should not be forwarded and send the email data that should not be forwarded back to the server (col.2, lines 30-40, col.6, lines 16-20, col.7, lines 22-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan and Moon because Moon's teaching of identifying the email data that should not be forwarded enables Narasimhan's email system to be aware of which email messages to filter or block.

18. As per claim 18, Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 5. Narasimhan did not specifically teach that if examining the email data against the filter control data indicates that email data includes confidential information that should not be forwarded, then the email data that is forwarded is a receipt confirmation message. Narasimhan taught to generate receipt data identifying the email data that should be forwarded (col.1, lines 46-51, col.4, lines 6-11, col.6, lines 11-18) and forward the receipt data via a computer network to a database (col.6, lines 19-21, 40-56). However, it would have been obvious that by identifying the email data that should be forwarded is equivalent to identify the email data that should not be forwarded. Moon taught to identify the email data that should not be forwarded and send the

email data that should not be forwarded back to the server (col.2, lines 30-40, col.6, lines 16-20, col.7, lines 22-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan and Moon because Moon's teaching of identifying the email data that should not be forwarded enables Narasimhan's email system to be aware of which email messages to filter or block.

19. Claims 9-13, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan et al (hereinafter Narasimhan), US Patent 6,073,165, in view of Birrell et al (hereinafter Birrell), US Patent 6,029,164.

20. As per claims 9, 11 and 17, Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1-2 and 5. Narasimhan further taught to forward information upon the satisfaction of a start criteria (col.5, lines 3-26). Narasimhan did not specifically teach that the forwarding of information is initiated from within a firewall upon the satisfaction of a start criteria, wherein the firewall includes a HTTP port, a SSL port, or a SMTP port, the computer network goes through the firewall and uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the SMTP port on the firewall, and the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses an authentication technique to authenticate user seeking to access the server. Birrell taught to email forwarding system to initiate forwarding of information from within a firewall (fig.1), wherein the firewall includes a SSL port, the computer network goes through the firewall and uses the SSL port on the firewall, and the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses an authentication technique to authenticate user seeking to access the server (col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-4,

col.5, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan and Birrell because Birrell's teaching of firewall enables Narasimhan's method to provide security protection and enforce security policies of the private network and protect critical resource (col.3, lines 53-62).

21. As per claims 10 and 12, Narasimhan and Birrell taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 9 and 11. Birrell further taught that the authentication technique includes a password (col.3, lines 65-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-36). Narasimhan and Birrell did not specifically teach that the start criteria includes the passing of a particular time period, the occurrence of a particular time of day, or the arrival of an email. LaPorta taught that forward criteria can include various forwarding options based on sender and time (col.5, lines 48-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan, Birrell and LaPorta because LaPorta's teaching of using various forwarding options enables Narasimhan and Birrell's system to forward email events using various triggering elements such as receiving time and email sender.

22. As per claim 13, Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3. Narasimhan further taught that the database is located on the destination server (e.g. client computer; fig.3). Narasimhan did not specifically teach that the email database is within a firewall, wherein the firewall includes a HTTP port, a SSL port, or a SMTP port, the communication channel goes through the firewall and uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the SMTP port, and the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses an

authentication technique to authenticate users seeking to access the server. Birrell taught to email forwarding system that the email database is within a firewall (figs.1-2: located on mail service system), wherein the firewall includes a SSL port, the communication channel goes through the firewall and uses the SSL port, and the database is on a server outside the firewall (client computer outside the firewall), wherein the server uses an authentication technique to authenticate users seeking to access the server (col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan and Birrell because Birrell's teaching of firewall enables Narasimhan's method to provide security protection and enforce security policies of the private network and protect critical resource (col.3, lines 53-62).

23. As per claim 15, Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4. Narasimhan did not specifically teach a firewall that includes a HTTP port, a SSL port, or a SMTP port, wherein the retrieval engine is on the client computer system within the firewall, the server database manager is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses authentication techniques to authenticate users seeking to access the server, the communication channel couples the client computer system and the server, wherein the communication channel goes through the firewall and uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the SMTP port, and the database is on the server. Birrell taught a email forwarding system to comprise a firewall that includes a SSL port, wherein the retrieval engine is on the client computer system within the firewall, the server database manager is on a server outside the firewall (fig.1), wherein the server uses authentication techniques to authenticate users seeking to access the server, the

communication channel couples the client computer system and the server, wherein the communication channel goes through the firewall and uses the SSL port, and the database is on the server (col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan and Birrell because Birrell's teaching of firewall enables Narasimhan's method to provide security protection and enforce security policies of the private network and protect critical resource (col.3, lines 53-62).

24. As per claim 19, Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 6. Narasimhan did not specifically teach a firewall that includes a HTTP port, a SSL port, or a SMTP port, wherein the filter and the data transmitter are on the client computer system within the firewall, the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses authentication techniques to authenticate users seeking to access the server, and the computer network couples the client computer system and the server, wherein the computer network goes through the firewall and uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the SMTP port. Birrell taught a email forwarding system to comprise a firewall that includes a SSL port, wherein the filter and the data transmitter are on the client computer system within the firewall, the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses authentication techniques to authenticate users seeking to access the server, and the computer network couples the client computer system and the server, wherein the computer network goes through the firewall and uses the SSL port (fig.1, col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of

Narasimhan and Birrell because Birrell's teaching of firewall enables Narasimhan's method to provide security protection and enforce security policies of the private network and protect critical resource (col.3, lines 53-62).

25. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan et al (hereinafter Narasimhan), US Patent 6,073,165, in view of "Official Notice".

26. As per claims 14 and 16, Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3-4. Narasimhan did not specifically teach to comprise determining whether the client computer system includes an updated version of modules used to forward the information corresponding to the new email events; and downloading to the client computer system the updated version of modules used to forward the information corresponding to the new email events. However, Official Notice is taken that the concept and advantages of detecting software version and downloading updated version of the software to support the system is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan and the method of detecting software versions to determine whether update is needed in order to provide new supports and fixes to the older version.

27. Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan and Moon as applied to claims 7-8 above, and further in view of Birrell et al (hereinafter Birrell), US Patent 6,029,164.

28. As per claim 20, Narasimhan and Moon taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 7. Narasimhan further taught to forward information upon the satisfaction of a start criteria (col.5, lines 3-26). Narasimhan and Moon did not specifically teach that the forwarding of the receipt data is initiated from within a firewall upon the satisfaction of a start criteria, wherein the firewall includes a HTTP port, a SSL port, or a SMTP port, the computer network goes through the firewall and uses the HTTP port, the SSL port, or the SMTP port on the firewall, and the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses an authentication technique to authenticate users seeking to access the server. Birrell taught a email forwarding system that the forwarding of the receipt data is initiated from within a firewall, wherein the firewall includes a SSL port, the computer network goes through the firewall and uses the SSL port on the firewall, and the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses an authentication technique to authenticate users seeking to access the server (fig.1, col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan, Moon and Birrell because Birrell's teaching of firewall enables Narasimhan and Moon's method to provide security protection and enforce security policies of the private network and protect critical resource (col.3, lines 53-62).

29. As per claim 21, Narasimhan and Moon taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 8. Narasimhan and Moon did not specifically teach that a firewall that includes a HTTP port, a SSL port, or a SMTP port; and wherein the filter, the receipt generator, and the data

transmitter are within the firewall; and the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses an authentication technique to authenticate users seeking to access the server. Birrell taught a email forwarding system with a firewall that includes a HTTP port, a SSL port, or a SMTP port; and wherein the filter, the receipt generator, and the data transmitter are within the firewall; and the database is on a server outside the firewall, wherein the server uses an authentication technique to authenticate users seeking to access the server (fig.1, col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Narasimhan, Moon and Birrell because Birrell's teaching of firewall enables Narasimhan and Moon's method to provide security protection and enforce security policies of the private network and protect critical resource (col.3, lines 53-62).

30. Claims 22-25 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birrell et al (hereinafter Birrell), US Patent 6,029,164, in view of Narasimhan et al (hereinafter Narasimhan), US Patent 6,073,165.

31. As per claim 22, Birrell taught the invention substantially as claimed including a system to forward email data, comprising:

a. A firewall that includes a SSL port (fig.1, col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-37);

b. A first computer outside the firewall (fig.1, col.2, lines 39-42);

c. A second computer within the firewall (fig.1, col.4, lines 5-15), the second computer includes receiving, filtering and organizing mail message functions (col.4, lines 16-19) from within the firewall (col.3, lines 53-67, col.4, lines 1-4);

d. A communication channel that couples the first computer to the second computer using the SSL port, wherein the communication channel goes through the firewall (fig.1, col.3, lines 63-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-37).

32. Birrell did not specifically teach in detail about the second computer. Narasimhan taught an email forwarding system having a mail server comprising:

i. A client configuration engine to initiate forwarding functionality when a start criteria is satisfied (col.4, lines 6-11, col.5, lines 3-40, col.6, lines 11-21, 40-56);

ii. A retrieval engine to retrieve email data from an email database (col.4, lines 6-11, col.5, lines 37-40, 50-60, col.6, lines 3-6, 11-21, 40-56);

iii. A format converter to convert the email data from a first format to a second format (col.5, lines 37-42, 56-60, col.6, lines 52-65); and

iv. A data transmitter to forward the email data from the second computer to the first computer (col.4, lines 6-11, col.5, lines 3-17, col.6, lines 11-21, 40-56).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Birrell and Narasimhan because Narasimhan's teaching of

using start criteria enables the users of Birrell's email forwarding system to program filter criteria to define conditions to filter and forward email messages (col.5, lines 3-17).

34. As per claim 23, Birrell and Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 22. Birrell further taught that the email data is an email, an email event, or an email message (col.2, lines 3-8, col.4, lines 16-19).

35. As per claim 24, Birrell and Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 22. Birrell further taught that the first computer uses an authentication technique to authenticate users seeking to access the first computer (col.3, lines 65-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-36).

36. As per claim 25, Birrell and Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 24. Birrell further taught that the authentication technique includes a password (col.3, lines 65-67, col.4, lines 1-4, col.5, lines 35-36).

37. As per claim 27, Birrell and Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 22. Narasimhan further taught the second format is a format used by the first computer (col.5, lines 37-42, 56-60, col.6, lines 52-65).

38. As per claim 28, Birrell and Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 22. Narasimhan further taught the second format is a common format (col.5, lines 37-42, 56-60, col.6, lines 52-65).

39. As per claim 29, Birrell and Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 22. Narasimhan further taught the second computer further includes a filter to examine the email data against filter control data to as least one of:

a. Determine the email data that will be forwarded (col.5, lines 3-26), and

b. Select a transfer protocol for the email data (col.5, lines 37-49, col.6, lines 40-56, col.7, lines 39-45),

Wherein one or both these actions produce a filtered email data (col.5, lines 3-26).

40. As per claim 30, Birrell and Narasimhan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 22. Birrell further taught a remote computer system, and another communication channel that couples the remote computer system to the first computer (col.2, lines 39-47).

41. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birrell and Narasimhan as applied to claims 22 above, and further in view of LaPorta et al (hereinafter LaPorta), US 5,918,158.

42. As per claim 26, Birrell and Narasimhan did not specifically teach that the start criteria is the passing of a particular time period, the occurrence of a particular time of day, or the arrival of

an email. LaPorta taught that forward criteria can include various forwarding options based on sender and time (col.5, lines 48-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Birrell, Narasimhan and LaPorta because LaPorta's teaching of using various forwarding options enables Birrell and Narasimhan's system to forward email events using various triggering elements such as receiving time and email sender.

Response to Arguments

43. Applicant's amendment with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

44. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Liu et al, US 6,760,752.

Owens et al, US 6,023,700.

Takahashi et al, US 6,442,589.

45. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

46. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

ksl
May 12, 2006